



Attorney's Docket No. 23015-1-0050

**PATENT**  
**EXPEDITED PROCEDURE**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Re Application of:

**ROLAND FALCON, ET AL.**

Serial No. **09/988,456**

Filed: **November 20, 2001**

For: **MULTIPLE CLIENT REMOTE  
AGENT NETWORK METHOD**

Art Unit: **2642**

Examiner: **Bing Q. Bui**

**RECEIVED**

**OCT 13 2004**

**Technology Center 2600**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE TO FIRST OFFICE ACTION**

Sir:

Applicants hereby respond to the Examiner's Office Action of April 2, 2004 in which the length of the abstract was objected to, claims 1-18 were rejected under the non-statutory doctrine of double patenting as unpatentable over claims 1-1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,320,956 to Cherry, and claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,175,564 to Miloslavsky, et al. (hereinafter "*Miloslavsky*").

Please enter Applicant's amendment and response into the record as follows:

**Amendments to the Specification** begin on page 2 of this paper

**Remarks/Arguments** begin on page 3 of this paper.